

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

[Plaintiff], LEONARD D. DUBOFF,

Plaintiff(s),

Civil No: 3:13-CV-00436-SI

vs.

[Defendant], THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO, LAWPROSE, INC.,  
and BRYAN A. GARNER,  
Defendant(s).

JOINT ALTERNATE DISPUTE  
RESOLUTION REPORT

Pursuant to LR 16-4(d), the parties to all cases, unless exempt, are required to confer regarding ADR and file this report within one-hundred fifty (150) days of the initiation of a lawsuit. This report is submitted in compliance with LR 16-4(d).

1. Have counsel held settlement discussions with their clients and the opposing party?  
☐ Yes ☒ No

If not, provide an explanation:

The parties have discussed a framework for settlement discussions, and determined that it would  
be most productive to engage in substantive discussions pursuant to the Court's ADR procedures.

2. The parties propose: *(check one of the following)*

- ☐ (a) That this case be referred to a neutral of their choice for ADR not sponsored by the court pursuant to LR 16-4(e)(1).
- ☐ (b) That the court refer this case to mediation using a Court-sponsored mediator or staff mediator. *(See LR 16-4(f) for Court-sponsored mediation procedures).* The parties seek a Court mediator because:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ (c) ADR may be helpful at a later date following completion of:

---

---

☒ (d) The parties believe the court would be of assistance in preparing for ADR by:

Pursuant to LR 16-4(e)(2), the parties request that the Court assign a settlement judge for a mediation on  

---

July 12, 2013, when representatives with settlement authority for both sides, and their counsel, will be available.  

---

☐ (e) The parties do not believe that any form of ADR will assist in the resolution of this case.

☐ (f) Other:

---

---

---

DATED: June 10, 2013

By: /s/ Anthony E. McNamer  
Plaintiff's Attorney

By: /s/ Klaus H. Hamm  
Defendant's Attorney